Reviewer’s report

Title: Integrating consumer engagement in health and medical research - an Australian framework

Version: 0 Date: 08 Oct 2016

Reviewer: Edilene Lopes McInnes

Reviewer's report:

General comments:

In general, the topic is interesting and relevant. It is not a new topic for discussion as there are quite a few studies on consumers/patients involvement in health research. However, the development of a new framework in this area is important, particularly taking into consideration that the review of literature identified this as a shortcoming in this field.

This paper has been submitted as a commentary, but it follows the structure of a research article, which can be confusing for the reader. For a research article, it needs more information on the methodology, particularly on the consensus workshop and the group discussions. However, for a commentary, there is too much information on the project itself, but not enough discussion on the relevance or the need of frameworks for consumer engagement. To solve this issue, the authors could refer the reader to an online publication with all the details of the project and dedicate more space for arguing why there is a need for a more structured approach for engaging consumers.

The article reports the outcomes of the project in a very positive light and the limitations of the study are not mentioned. There is no discussion about the challenges and opportunities in developing a new consumer engagement framework.

Specific comments:

Abstract:

Line 33: The authors should briefly explain what the framework is: "was used to generate a consumer engagement framework".

Line 34: semi-structure interviews (with whom?); facilitated group discussions (with whom?); and consensus workshop (with whom?)

Line 39: The word "however" does not make sense in this sentence; you should delete it.
Lines 47 and 48: Please re-write the sentence beginning with: "This evidence-driven framework…".

Line 48: "This framework is presented as a contribution…".

Main text:

Background

Line 79: The authors should change "gets done" for a less informal expression.

Line 91: 'Better' is an ambiguous word. Could you explain in the text what you mean by 'better' research?

Lines 92 - 96: I would re-write this paragraph. The authors can improve the readability by making the following changes:

The South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute (SAHMRI) was (is)? a new Institute and is in a partnership of the state's universities and the state government. SAHMRI claims to have a unique, state-wide model, with an Advanced Health Science and Translation Centre, with an agenda of research excellence with a strong focus on research translation. SAHMRI claims to have a unique, state-wide model. It is a partnership of the state's universities, and the state government (health, treasury and science). South Australia has a state-wide Advanced Health Science and Translation Centre, led by SAHMRI.

Line 105: Please remove "with a remit for an entire jurisdiction - the State of South Australia."

Lines 109 to 137: There is enough detail on the literature review, but you need to add more information on the other methods employed in this project (semi-structured interviews, facilitated group decisions, and consensus workshop).

Line 120: An environmental scan of the grey and peer-reviewed literatures was were undertaken.

Lines 121 to 124: Search engines SciVerse Hub, Google, and Google Scholar were utilised. Electronic biomedical databases searched were: CINAHL, Pub-Med, Cochrane Library, OVID, and ProQuest. Data was extracted from relevant links such as title, source, author, URL, content description and main conclusions. Electronic biomedical databases searched were: CINAHL, Pub-Med, Cochrane Library, OVID, and ProQuest. Years searched were 1988-2013 inclusive.

Lines 135 and 136: Is there any particular reason for hand searching the journal "Health Expectations Journal"? It seems rather arbitrary.
Lines 136 and 137: It could be useful to explain which criteria were used to select the articles to be included in the literature review. In this section, the reader may benefit from a table showing how many articles were found, from which source and how many were selected.

Line 138: You could mention the average duration of the interviews and how the interviews were analysed (Did you use a particular framework or method?)

Line 145: It is not clear what the objective of the facilitated group discussions was. Can the authors add a sentence clarifying that?

Line147: There's no information on how the consensus workshop was conducted. Was it held for one day/ half a day? How much information was provided to participants and how was it provided? How did the group reach consensus?

Lines 150 to 192: The text needs to be edited to make it easier for the reader to follow the argument.

Lines 194 to 201: The authors should break down this sentence into at least two sentences.

What do you mean by "many benefits could be realised"?

Line 217: "A set of Principles, considered essential to underpin the consumer and community engagement framework, were agreed" - agreed by whom?

Lines 236 to 246 should be placed before Table 2 (before line 216).

Lines 256 to 258: The authors should add some references here to support what they are saying.

Lines 279 to 284: The conclusion is too short. The authors should contextualise your findings in the field of consumer involvement in research and explaining the relevance of having such frameworks in place.

Tables:

Table 2: Principles to Support Consumer 219 and Community Engagement at SAHMRI

You do not need a table to present this information.

Figures:

Figure 1: This figure is not really clear. For example, I am assuming you want to say that Aboriginal Health needs to be part of all research themes. However, "Aboriginal Health" arrow is a solid colour that goes behind and in front of the other research themes - it does not seem
integrated into them. This is the same problem with the research pillars. The way the research translation framework is presented is also not really clear and seems almost like an afterthought rather than something that is integrated into the research pillars and research themes of the institute. I think that, visually, this does not translate what you are saying in the text.

Figure 2: This figure is not clear either.
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